

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
RAMONA COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP**

A regular meeting of the Ramona Community Planning Group (RCPG) was held December 3, 2009, at 7 p.m., at the Ramona Community Center, 434 Aqua Lane, Ramona, California.

In Attendance:	Chad Anderson	Chris Anderson	Torry Brean (Arr. 7:25)
	Matt Deskovick	Kathy S. Finley	Dennis Grimes
	Bob Hailey	Eb Hogervorst	Kristi Mansolf
	Jim Piva	Dennis Sprong	Paul Stykel
	Angus Tobiason	Richard Tomlinson	

Excused Absence: Katherine L. Finley

Chris Anderson, RCPG Chair, acted as the Chair of the meeting. Kristi Mansolf, RCPG Secretary, acted as Secretary of the meeting.

ITEM 1: The Chair Called the Meeting to Order at 7:05 p.m.

ITEM 2: Pledge of Allegiance

ITEM 3: The Secretary Determined a Quorum was Present

ITEM 4: LIST OF ABSENTEES FOR THIS MEETING. Determination of Excused and Unexcused Absences by the RCPG – Secretary Will Read Record Separately from the Minutes – Katherine L. Finley had an excused absence.

ITEM 5: Approval of Order of the Agenda (Action) – Not Addressed

ITEM 6: ANNOUNCEMENTS & Correspondence Received (Chair) – None

ITEM 7: APPROVAL OF MINUTES 11-5-09 (Action)

TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 5, 2009.

Upon motion made by Bob Hailey and seconded by Kathy S. Finley, the Motion **passed 11-0-2-0-2**, with Dennis Grimes and Dennis Sprong abstaining, and Torry Brean and Katherine L. Finley absent.

ITEM 8: NON-AGENDA ITEMS Presentations on Land Issues not on Current Agenda (No Presentations on Ongoing Projects – These Must be Agendized)

Speaker: Matt Deskovick, Ramona Resident

Mr. Deskovick asked the Board to remember why we call a “point of order” and “call the question.” Someone called the question a couple of months ago and not everyone had had a chance to talk. If someone is off track or out of order, it is okay to call a “point of order.” We need to give each other the opportunity to talk. That is why we are here. “Calling the question” impedes the process.

ITEM 9: Presentation by Devon Muto, County DPLU. Update on GP Update Changes. (Discussion and Possible Action)

Mr. Muto said County Staff formulated a recommendation on the GP Update. They are now in the process of Planning Commission hearings. Then they will go before the Board of Supervisors. In the meetings with the Planning Commission, they are trying to identify major issues and eliminate what is not a major issue. The EIR was completed and put out for public review. There are lots of comments. Staff has been going through them. They are not seeing big changes – may be minor revisions to environmental analysis and policy. They are taking the major components of the GP Update to the Planning Commission, such as the Land Use Maps. The components support such things as the community plans and conservation subdivisions. The Planning Commission focused on the Land Use Maps for the communities.

Major issues that have been identified will be addressed in January. There will be a continuation water hearing on December 4, 2009.

Ramona was discussed. The Land Use Map hasn't changed. Mr. Muto presented a chart that summarized the Land Use Map preliminary Staff recommendations for Ramona. The chart matches the map. Some changes were made to show lands that were added to open space recently. Some previously identified RMWD lands were shown as open space, but should be public/semi-public. If the RCPG has input, now is the time to raise issues to consider. DPLU received RCPG support for most of the map. Mr. Muto invited the RCPG to modify or restate support of the map.

A letter was received from the RMWD regarding concerns of growth. Mr. Muto says they want to meet with the RMWD to discuss their concerns.

One area of concern is by the Cumming Ranch where what is on the map doesn't jive with what is proposed for the area. This area needs to be revisited. A property owner next to the Cumming Ranch says her density is low compared to everyone else in her area.

The Chair asked if this property was on the referral map?

Mr. Muto didn't know.

Mr. Sprong said he felt there was a good relationship between the RCPG and DPLU until a month ago. A lot of information was disseminated on the GP Update right before our last meeting.

Mr. Muto said many communities were ready to go. A notice went out.

Mr. Sprong asked if Ramona is behind in the process?

Mr. Muto said if we are still formulating information then we are behind.

Mr. Sprong said there seemed to be a breakdown of information coming from the County.

Mr. Muto said that all recommendations by the Planning Commission are tentative. He will check to make sure we are on the list to receive information.

The Chair said she had concerns because she didn't know the GP Update was going to the Planning Commission until a week before the meeting. Referring to the chart Mr. Muto had distributed, the Chair said the RCPG had said we didn't want less density than 1 dwelling unit per 40 acres. The chart shows the CPG recommendation is "no position." She asked how DPLU will respond to questions and when will we see the responses to the DEIR?

Mr. Muto said they will respond to questions when they respond to the EIR comments. Responses will be completed early next year.

The Chair said zoning maps will come out at the middle of the year.

Ms. Mansolf said that when the Emergency Evacuation Road was being considered through the Grasslands, Mr. Muto said that possibly a different alignment for the SA 603 could be considered for the GP Update. Is getting the SA 603 back on the map a possibility?

Mr. Muto said that it will not be going back on the map. It is not a feasible road.

Mr. Hailey asked for clarification on the property in the vicinity of the Cumming Ranch that is different in density.

Mr. Muto said they thought the densities would match, but they don't, so they will be looking at it again.

Mr. Grimes asked for clarification of Mr. Muto's statement that "Countywide IDs 1 through 5 would be designated open space and conservation land for preservation purposes."

Mr. Grimes voiced concern about any further diminishment of currently limited water district spray field lands based resulting from Mr. Muto's comments regarding conservation land for preservation purposes. . Mr. Grimes stated, "Water District lands are for the water district's use on behalf of the community and its customers. Designating or limiting the use of these lands by moving them to an open space conservation designation must not limit their use or utility to the Water District." Mr. Grimes asked for clarification of Mr. Muto's earlier Countywide ID statement and assurances that water district land use would not be limited.

Mr. Muto said if the land was in open space and RMWD property, it is shown as public facility. This change was made when they realized the correct designation was not shown on the map.

Mr. Grimes then said "The RMWD will always have a need for additional land for spray fields and this use must not be diminished."

Mr. Deskovick said that he would love to see the preservation lands back in private ownership so they can be ranched. He asked how it could be changed so that the government doesn't own them?

Mr. Muto said that if areas are identified for growth in a plan, they are better able to justify growth.

Mr. Deskovick said he would like to see the preservation lands go back to public ownership. He doesn't know why they have to change.

Mr. Muto said the areas were identified as such in the Open Space Element. To change them now would be a major change from how this is handled in the State.

Mr. Muto said that there is an issue with the Town Center and the Big Box development. There may be a need to do an offset of the residential area that we want changed to commercial.

The Chair asked if the lands that won't be built upon were taken out of the population figure for Ramona.

Mr. Muto said they were, and the population dropped by a few hundred.

The Chair asked where this density would be absorbed.

Mr. Muto said the density would not be absorbed unless there is the need for an offset.

The Chair asked Mr. Muto to please bring this to the RCPG's attention should it come up in the future.

ITEM 10: FORMATION OF CONSENT CALENDAR – No items were pulled.

ITEM 11: SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

11-A: SOUTH (Hailey) (No Business)

11-B: WEST (Mansolf) (Action Items)

**11-A: Montecito Ranch, SP 01-001, GPA 04-013, TM 5250RPL.
935 Acres, 417 Homes. Project to Include a Wastewater Reclamation
Facility. Access off Ash St., Chris Brown, Proponent (w/T&T)**

Mr. Brown presented the Montecito Ranch project. Cal Fire approved the Fire Protection Plan. Mr. Brown distributed copies of the letter from the Ramona Fire Department.

The project has evolved over a decade. In 1999 the property was purchased and an LLC was formed. Later that year Supervisor Jacob had a tour of the Ramona Grasslands. In 2001, Supervisor Jacob met with the landowners of the Ramona Grasslands. In April, 2001, the project was 2 and 4 acres as shown in the Ramona Community Plan. In June, 2001, the County sent a letter signed by Bill Stocks saying that the open space was fragmented. There was no species flow. The Grasslands was first mentioned while dismissed as not being sensitive. The project needed to provide open space. The applicants met with the County and it was determined that the density had to be in one area and open space be provided. One-half acre lot sizes were derived from the Ramona Community Plan. The project is 417 homes – the maximum allowed. Mr. Brown said 467 homes could be built. In 2003, there was a meeting with Supervisor Jacob. At this time, the Grasslands were more accepted. 601 acres were to be in open space. A 2 acre equestrian area will be provided and a day facility, for use by those in the area. A fully developed 8.3 acre park will be provided. There will be a snack bar and playing fields that can be used for Pony Baseball and soccer.

There are significant archaeological resources on the site. 35 will be preserved and 1 capped. The ranch house has been there for 185 years. It will be rehabilitated and used by the Community in some form.

Improvements will be made to Highland Valley/Dye and Montecito Rd. The Fire Protection Plan will be 3 level and tiered.

Ms. Mansolf gave the West Subcommittee report. The West Subcommittee voted to send comments. Comments include: There are concerns the 1 million gallon water tank on an adjoining property shown in the plans does not have consent by the property owners to be put there. That issue should be resolved. Sewer – a long term utility, is safer for the Community in the long run. Sewer hookup versus the wrf should be considered over the lifetime of the structure. When amortized over the life of the structure, the cost of hooking up to sewer is nominal. The project should be hooked up to the sewer. We would like to see the school site retained for the future use

of the RUSD. There are long term concerns about allowing a package treatment plant in this project.

A fire station should be considered in the vicinity of Montecito Rd. and Montecito Way, possibly as a joint venture between the Montecito Ranch project and other development proposed for the area. This would be desirable to provide a better response time to serve the project rather than having emergency vehicles come from Station 80.

Mr. Piva gave the T&T Subcommittee report. The traffic issues have been carefully looked at by the subcommittee. A lot of road improvements will be made. The Subcommittee agrees with almost all the road improvements proposed, and had additional road recommendations they wanted to see incorporated into the project traffic improvements.

Speaker: Thad Clendenen, Ramona Chamber President

Mr. Clendenen read a letter of support for the project from the Ramona Chamber of Commerce. They feel the project will be a positive addition to Ramona and its businesses. They believe the project will bring jobs and financial benefits to Ramona. The addition of 417 affluent families will be an economic spark for Ramona businesses. This project, together with the Ramona Village Design efforts should bring some very exciting and much needed growth to our community and businesses. The open space being preserved throughout Montecito Ranch will be a benefit to the Community, as will the trails, equestrian facilities, new community parks and ball fields that can be enjoyed by the entire Community. Millions will be spent on road improvements in Ramona. The Chamber feels Montecito Ranch is committed to developing a first rate community while respecting the unique character of Ramona.

Speaker: Kareen Madden, Ramona Resident

Ms. Madden has watched the project change over the years. She likes unclustered homes better. She likes what Mr. Brown has accomplished with the project. Ms. Madden likes the trails, pathways and Community park, all open to the Community.

Speaker: Carol Fowler, Ramona Resident

Ms. Fowler is the Economic Development Chair for the Chamber of Commerce Economic Development Committee. She is in favor of the project. The no-growth Planning Group stymied Main Street. She sees this Planning Group as being good for the economic development of Ramona. The Transportation/Trails Subcommittee has been scrutinizing this project for years. The project offers everything. The RMWD issues are expensive and will be addressed. This project will have a positive impact on Main Street. These people will shop here. She thinks the Community helped to make it a great project.

Speaker: Charlene Foote, Ramona Resident

Ms. Foote drives all over looking at properties. She feels the Montecito Ranch project is an excellent project. The planning for equestrian activities and trails has been done very well. She is proud to have this project in the community. A project of this caliber in Ramona will be an asset to the Community. She wants more developments to look like this. She feels the project developed through the Planning Group's determination to make it good.

The Chair read a letter from Lori Mould, who was unable to attend the meeting. Ms. Mould supports the project and asks the RCPG to support the project. She feels the infrastructure to be

provided by the project applicants and the shaping of the project by seeing what the Community wanted makes this a worthwhile project to move forward.

The Chair also read a letter from Karen Pellettera, who supports the project but was unable to attend the meeting. Ms. Peleterra feels the horse trail system is great. Residents will be able to ride out of their back gate. The lot sizes are good and a lot of land is being preserved. The parks will be open to all residents. The SDCE excludes Ramona residents without membership cards.

There were 4 speaker slips for people wanting to register to support, but not wishing to speak.

Speaker: Doug Funk, Ramona Resident

Mr. Funk wanted to clarify 1 issue. Two years ago the Lemurian Fellowship was made an offer to buy 2 acres for the water tank site proposed for Montecito Ranch. They were not interested in the money. They felt the water tank would be a monstrosity and would impact the neighbors. The Fellowship is not interested in selling the land. Mr. Funk said that the people speaking in support of the project won't have a wastewater reclamation facility next to their property.

Mr. Deskovick said when SDCE built the treatment plant out there, the RMWD took it over. We have to look at the project as a whole. He feels the treatment plant/sewer issue is the applicant's battle to fight.

Mr. Grimes commended Mr. Brown's self-described hand-coloring job on a prior large rural lot design Montecito plan map. Mr. Grimes stated he continued to prefer that design over the current clustered conservation subdivision plan directed and advocated by the County staff. Mr. Grimes continued, stating "It is apparent that the County staff has had heavy handed, overriding input to the design process for this project and the project does not reflect the correct character for Ramona. The original plan with large rural parcels would have supported septic and not have required the package treatment plant now proposed. A lot of time has passed and the project has changed significantly."

While stating opposition to the smart growth/clustered conservation subdivision design of the project, Grimes said he supported the historic ranch house, equestrian areas, and urged the retention rather than deletion as Mr. Brown suggested, of the previously designated Charter School site and urged a formal re-designation of the school site and surrounding ball fields as a future Ramona School District Elementary School site.

Mr. Grimes stated opposition to the proposed package treatment plant for a project of this size. As reasons the plant should not be approved over a municipal sewer connection, Mr. Grimes cited: long term financials risk to Montecito Ranch property owners for the operation and maintenance of the plant, their financial liability in the event the plant failed, and the significant health risk to the surrounding Ramona Community in the event it failed or was improperly operated.

He urged instead reopening discussions with the Ramona Sewer District and negotiating a feasible cost to expand and connect to the Ramona Sewer District as the better long-term solution to reduce health and financial risk to the Community and County of San Diego. He stated Montecito Ranch shouldn't have to pay for existing system's shortcomings but should pay for their fair share of expanded capacity required for the homes and facilities in the development.

Mr. Anderson suggested putting trees in the open space.

Mr. Hailey was not familiar with details of the wastewater reclamation facility.

The plans for the facility were presented. The plans had just been recently received.

Mr. Brown said the Board of Supervisors will certify the EIR. They will choose the sewer option or the wastewater reclamation facility option. The project is not in the Sewer District or in the latent powers area. The Board will approve the project with the sewer hookup or they will approve the project with the wastewater reclamation facility. They are required to have an 84 day wet storage pond with the wastewater reclamation facility. They will come back with the design in the future. The facility will be located across from the ranch area.

Mr. Hailey said he is favorably disposed to the project. His concerns remain with traffic impacts for Montecito Road and especially Hwy 67. He likes the project.

Mr. Brean said that the park is beautiful and he appreciates the trails. The road issue is messed up. He would rather see something else. Mr. Brean said the project represents for him frustration about the local planning process and our ability to give input. He feels cosmetic issues are being addressed. Community character is impacted by lot sizes. We should be able to have influence over the community character of the lot sizes. He hasn't seen any real efforts on this. It has been said the County used extreme pressure and there has been no push back. The proposed lot sizes don't fit in that part of town. Most of them don't allow the type of animal keeping that can use the trails.

Mr. Tobiason asked why there are 11 open space lots? Is this normal? He still has concerns with the project vulnerability to wildfires. The 2007 fire burned through the ranch in 15 minutes. He remembers the Ramona Fire Department wrote a letter about inadequate fire protection being proposed for the project a couple of years ago.

The Chair said that Mr. Tobiason has said this before about a letter and inadequate fire protection, but he doesn't have the letter and the Ramona Fire Department has approved the Fire Protection Plan, so this is a moot point.

Mr. Tobiason continued. When the SPA was planned 25 years ago, it was to be 2, 4 and 8 acre lots that would fit in with the adjacent lots on Cedar Street and the surrounding area. The sewer is running out capacity. There are not enough sprayfields or places for sprayfields.

Ms. Mansolf appreciates the park, ballfields and the trails, and that the Community will have access to them. She appreciates the efforts to integrate the project into the Community. She likes the idea that the Ranch House will be available to the Community. Not all project applicants have been so generous to the Community when planning their projects. Mr. Brown has really made efforts to see what the Community wanted. Originally there were no horse lots. We asked for horse lots and they became part of the project. Ms. Mansolf feels that the project is too much density for the area it is proposed in. She would like to see the water tank issue be resolved and is surprised the tank is still shown on the map with no resolution. Sewer would be better overall for the Community. Due to the density, there will be traffic impacts on Hwy 67 as all residents will be using it. There is no money available to improve Hwy 67.

The Chair said she is in support of the wastewater reclamation facility. Mr. Brown will come back with additional information on this at a future meeting. Mr. Brown is dealing with decisions with of how the past RCPG acted. The project is outside of the RMWD. It would be more realistic to get the RMWD to the table.

Mr. Sprong said he is okay with the wastewater reclamation facility. Either the sewer hookup or the wastewater reclamation facility is okay with him. The project will be phased in. Hopefully we will have a viable economy in Ramona when the project is built so people won't have to go down the hill for work and services to help with traffic concerns. There will be a better chance of getting people out of here than the SDCE during a fire.

Mr. Stykel said that Mr. Brown has done a fabulous job with the project and the wastewater reclamation facility. He likes the entire project and feels this is a quality project that will bring commerce and many jobs to Ramona. It will be good for the local economy. If the project doesn't get approved, it will go to conservation and won't get used.

Kathy S. Finley took the tour offered by Mr. Brown, and discussed the project with him so she could understand it. She listened to the history. The County had them cornered. We had them cornered. Past planning groups influenced this project. The County supported them. Mr. Brown showed her the documents that showed this. She thanked Mr. Brown for providing the RCPG with the map that one, past RCPG had asked for that included all the elements the RCPG wanted to see as part of the project.

Mr. Tomlinson lives on Ash Street and will be directly impacted by the project. He got on the RCPG to oppose the project. Now he likes it. The coyotes will remain. The wastewater reclamation facility is a great idea. We can't punish landowners for County decisions.

Mr. Brown had a chance to rebuttal the comments. Regarding the 11 lots – in the final conditions, the open space will be held by a group such as the Wildlife Research Institute, the Endangered Habitats League or the County.

Mr. Tomlinson said that the Subdivision Map Act has certain requirements that must be met.

Mr. Brown said that the purple pipe will be used as part of the project for the reclaimed water. There will be vegetation on the slopes to keep them from sliding. The site will use 100 percent of the water produced by the wastewater reclamation facility. As far as septic – if there were 2 and 4 acre lots – Mr. Brown was told that septic are not the best technology. He doesn't know if septic would be allowed for 2 and 4 acre lots in this area. They will build the facility to meet the needs of the project. They will give it to the RMWD built to all current standards and let them run it. A firm such as Dudek & Associates could run it. The County would sign off on it. This is what they would like to do. There will be 2 phases for the project. In Phase 1, 200 homes will be built. In Phase 2, 217 homes will be built. Roads will be built first, then parks. They will use contour grading. They may begin cutting the lots in 2014 if the economy is different. As far as traffic, some of the existing intersections without the Montecito Ranch project operate at a LOS C. If Montecito Ranch went away, the LOS would continue to fail. The proposed project traffic mitigation measures will enhance traffic flow.

MOTION: TO APPROVE AND SEND COMMENTS.

Upon motion made by Dennis Sprong and seconded by Bob Hailey, the Motion **passed 9-4-1-0-1**, with Torry Brean, Dennis Grimes, Kristi Mansolf and Angus Tobiason voting no, Richard Tomlinson abstaining, and Katherine L. Finley absent.

MOTION: TO RECOMMEND TO MODIFY THE MAP – WHERE IT SAYS “CHARTER SCHOOL,” IT SHOULD SAY “SCHOOL/PARK SITE.”

There was discussion on the Motion.

MOTION: TO CALL THE QUESTION.

Upon motion made by Matt Deskovick, the Motion failed 8-4-2-0-1, with Chris Anderson, Kathy S. Finley, Kristi Mansolf, and Paul Stykel voting no, Dennis Grimes and Richard Tomlinson abstaining, and Katherine L. Finley absent. (Two-thirds approval required.)

(Voting on the Original Motion)

Upon motion made by Bob Hailey and seconded by Torry Brean, the Motion **passed 12-0-2-0-1**, with Chris Anderson and Richard Tomlinson abstaining, and Katherine L. Finley absent.

Mr. Piva brought forward the additional recommendations made by the T&T Subcommittee on roads.

MOTION: 1) TO WIDEN THE NORTH LEG OF SR 78/SR 67/10TH ST. INTERSECTION TO ACCOMMODATE A SOUTHBOUND PROTECTED LEFT TURN/THROUGH/RIGHT TURN LANE CONFIGURATION; AND WIDEN THE SOUTH LEG OF THE HIGHLAND VALLEY RD./DYE RD./SR 67 INTERSECTION TO ACCOMMODATE A RIGHT TURN TRAP LANE FOR NORTHBOUND TO EASTBOUND DRIVERS;

2) SET ASIDE FUNDS IN THE COUNTY TIF PROGRAM FOR IMPROVEMENTS AT SPECIFIC LOCATIONS, AS DISCUSSED IN THE TIA, BUT ALSO INSIST THAT IF A SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENT IS DEEMED IMPRACTICAL OR IMPOSSIBLE TO BUILD BY THE COUNTY AND/OR CALTRANS, THE TIF FUNDS SHALL NOT BE SIMPLY REFUNDED, BUT INSTEAD, THE FUNDS SHALL BE USED FOR OTHER NEEDED IMPROVEMENTS THAT COULD INCLUDE ADDITIONAL INTERSECTION OR PRACTICAL SEGMENT IMPROVEMENTS ALONG SR 67 WITHIN THE COMMUNITY OF RAMONA.

3) DRAFT A LETTER TO THE COUNTY AND CALTRANS INFORMING THEM OF THE SAME.

(Discussion on the Motion)

A few people felt the motion was not clear.

Mr. Brown was concerned that the motion may be misconstrued by the County.

(Voting on the Motion)

Upon motion made by Jim Piva and seconded by Bob Hailey, the Motion **failed 3-7-3-0-2**, with Chris Anderson, Torry Brean, Kathy S. Finley, Dennis Grimes, Bob Hailey, Kristi Mansolf and Paul Stykel voting no, Dennis Sprong, Angus Tobiason and Richard Tomlinson abstaining, and Matt Deskovick and Katherine L. Finley absent.

(Mr. Stykel left the meeting at 9.)

11-B-2: TM 5329, AD 03-058, S03-053, Mt. Woodson, The Gallery. 84 acres, 22 Residential lots, 3 Open Space lots, 1.5 acre minimum lot size.

17 and 18 General Plan Designation, and Scenic Designator Apply. Project Access to Be off Hwy 67. Vance, Representative (w/T&T)

Lee Vance presented the project. The site is 84 acres. It will be subdivided into 22 residential lots with 2 lots of open space. Lot area averaging is permitted for the project, with not less than 75 percent of the zoning to be applied. For awhile they couldn't use the primary, existing access for the project as it crosses a wetland as previously defined by the old County Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO). The County modified the RPO and now impacts to wetlands are allowed under certain circumstances. The Wildland Fire Ordinance will be adhered to. A secondary access is being sought. They have been in continuing discussions with CalFire to use their access road. They filed to do this with CalFire in Sacramento and paid the \$6 thousand required to do so. Since then, the person responsible for this process has retired and they are trying to find out what happened to the funds. The Ramona Fire Marshall has been extremely helpful with this. They have also had past discussions with the HOA at Mt. Woodson to have an access through that project, since such as access will benefit both developments. They have to recontact the HOA to renew these discussions.

Ms. Mansolf gave the West Subcommittee report. There were no concerns brought forward from the information presented. Several studies will be done that will provide more information, but these are not available yet. The access issue is unresolved. The Subcommittee approved the project in concept so it could move forward.

Mr. Piva gave the T&T Subcommittee report. They also approved the project in concept but looked forward to more information. Trails issues were discussed that included access to existing trails and the applicant providing a parking area for the Mt. Woodson hikers.

Ms. Kathy S. Finley said that the County doesn't want us to approve the project in concept but to wait to give final approval when all the information is available.

MOTION: TO SEND THE SUBCOMMITTEE COMMENTS. COMMENTS: 1) WOULD LIKE TO SEE A ROAD UP INTO THE MT. WOODSON PROPERTY. THIS WOULD GIVE BOTH NEIGHBORHOODS ACCESS OUT IN THE EVENT OF A FIRE. 2) WOULD LIKE TO SEE SPECIFIC PROJECT DETAILS. 3) WOULD LIKE EXISTING TRAILS ENHANCED AND CONNECTED.

Upon motion made by Jim Piva and seconded by Torry Brean, the Motion **passed 12-0-0-0-3**, with Matt Deskovick, Katherine L. Finley, and Paul Stykel absent.

11-C: EAST (Kathy S. Finley)(No Business)

11-D: PARKS (Tomlinson) (No Business)

11-E: AHOPE (Grimes) (No Business)

11-F: GP Update Plan (Anderson) (No Business)(See #9)

11-G: CUDA (Brean)(Action Items)

11-G-1:APN 281-203-10-00, 212 B St. Addition to an Existing House and Conversion of an Attached Patio to Habitable Space. Addition of 2 New Homes. 2 Separate Permits. Site Plan Waiver Request. D Designator Applies. C. Jones, Representative

Mr. Brean said the CUDA Subcommittee approved both permits that were presented with no concerns.

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE SITE PLAN WAIVER FOR: 1) ADDITION TO AN EXISTING HOUSE AND CONVERSION OF AN ATTACHED PATIO TO HABITABLE SPACE; AND 2) ADDITION OF 2 NEW HOMES.

Upon motion made by Torry Brean and seconded by Bob Hailey, the Motion **passed 11-1-0-0-3**, with Rochard Tomlinson voting no, and Matt Deskovick, Katherine L. Finley and Paul Stykel absent.

11-G-2:TM 5564, 1550 Keyes Rd., Proposed Subdivision of 10.38 Acres into 6 Lots, 5 Residential and 1 Road, North of Hanson Ln, Walsh, Representative (w/T&T)

The CUDA Subcommittee wanted to see the cul-de-sac moved to the center of the property, which would eliminate the flag lot.

The Transportation/Trails Subcommittee discussed having a 10 foot pathway and a sidewalk. The County is not requiring a 130 foot easement to accommodate the South Bypass.

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE TM 5564, 1550 KEYES RD., SUBDIVISION OF 10.38 ACRES INTO 6 LOTS, 5 RESIDENTIAL AND 1 ROAD, NORTH OF HANSON LN., AS PRESENTED, WITH THE RECOMMENDATION TO COUNTY STAFF THEY ISSUE A WAIVER OF THE MINIMUM LOT SIZE TO ACCOMMODATE MOVING THE LOT 6 CUL-DE-SAC TO THE CENTER OF LOTS 1, 2, 4 AND 5.

Upon motion made by Torry Brean and seconded by Bob Hailey, the Motion **passed 12-0-0-0-3**, with Matt Deskovick, Katherine L. Finley and Paul Stykel absent.

11-G-3:STP 09-005, Palomar Pomerado Health, Ramona Satellite Clinic, Main St. 2.6 acres. D5 Special Area Regulation Applies, 2 Story Clinic, 37,500 sq. ft. Access to be from Main St. and from 13th and 14th St. Miller, MetroPlan, Representative (w/T&T)

Mr. Brean gave the CUDA Subcommittee report. The CUDA voted to restate support for the land use aspects of the project. The Subcommittee also voted to express opposition to the median in the intersection of 13th Street and Main Street, blocking left hand turns from 13th Street onto Main.

Mr. Piva said that the Transportation/Trails Subcommittee reviewed the project. There is still the issue of building over B Street so that it can't be built in the future if we need it. There were concerns about only being able to go right on Main Street and having to u-turn at the light at 14th.

Mr. Brean said that the CUDA Subcommittee doesn't like the road dynamics. No one likes it. PPH doesn't like it. Someone has to send a message.

The Chair said the Design Review Board approved the project unanimously. She added that B Street is not addressed.

Rich Miller, representing PPH, said that as concerns the median, CalTrans is making everyone do this. B Street has nothing to do with CalTrans. They do not intend to build on the easement for B Street.

The Chair said that medians have been shown to be effective in calming traffic, so now they are more widely used.

Ms. Mansolf said that the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project was going to come out during the next week and the next RCPG meeting was January 7, 2010. She asked Mr. Miller if comments would be accepted if the RCPG meeting was after or on the due date for comments. He said that as PPH is the lead agency for the project, he will accept comments should the RCPG have any.

The Chair left for a moment and Mr. Sprong, the Vice-Chair, ran the meeting.

Mr. Miller said that no ambulances will be going in or out of the facility. Ambulances will go to Pomerado Hospital and Palomar Hospital.

Mr. Brean said he would like to separate the median issue from the project in the motion.

MOTION: 1) TO SUBMIT COMMENTS. WE LOOK FORWARD TO REVIEWING THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION. 2) TO APPROVE THE SITE PLAN AS SUBMITTED WITH THE NON-CIRCULATION ELEMENT MODIFICATIONS ACCEPTED.

Upon motion made by Chris Anderson and seconded by Kathy S. Finley, the Motion **passed 12-0-0-0-3**, with Matt Deskovick, Katherine L. Finley and Paul Stykel absent.

MOTION: TO EXPRESS OPPOSITION TO THE MEDIAN IN THE INTERSECTION OF 13TH ST. AND MAIN ST., BLOCKING LEFT HAND TURNS FROM 13TH ST.

Upon motion made by Torry Brean and seconded by Jim Piva, the Motion **passed 12-0-0-0-3**, with Matt Deskovick, Katherine L. Finley and Paul Stykel absent.

A copy of the letter written for the median issue motion will be sent to CalTrans.

Ms. Anderson resumed being the Chair.

11-H: Transportation/Trails (Piva)(Action Items)

11-H-1: Ramona Air Center, Consideration of Sidewalks on Montecito Rd. West of Montecito Way as a Condition of Project, Higgins, Representative

The Ramona Air Center project is being conditioned by DPW to provide sidewalks at the end of Montecito Road by the Airport. Karl Higgins presented photo simulations of how this would look. As this area is very rural, the sidewalks looked out of place in the photos. Letters of opposition to having sidewalks in this area have been written by RTA and the Design Review Board

Mr. Piva said the Transportation/Trails Subcommittee voted to reject the sidewalks and instead have a 10 foot wide improved pathway to be enhanced with stabilized DG, soil amendment, and lodgepole pine fencing.

MOTION: TO REJECT THE SIDEWALKS AND INSTEAD PUT IN THE 10 FOOT WIDE IMPROVED PATHWAY TO BE ENHANCED WITH STABILIZED DG SOIL AMENDMENT AND LODGEPOLE PINE FENCE, WHERE APPROPRIATE.

Upon motion made by Jim Piva and seconded by Dennis Sprong, the Motion **passed 11-0-1-0-3**, with Angus Tobiason abstaining, and Matt Deskovick, Katherine L. Finley and Paul Stykel absent.

11-H-2:TM 5564, 1550 Keyes Rd., Proposed Subdivision of 10.38 Acres into 6 Lots, 5 Residential and 1 Road, North of Hanson Ln Walsh, Representative (w/CUDA)

11-H-3:TM 5329, AD 03-058, S03-053, Mt. Woodson, The Gallery. 84 acres, 22 Residential lots, 3 Open Space lots, 1.5 acre minimum lot size. 17 and 18 General Plan Designation, and Scenic Designator Apply. Project Access to Be off Hwy 67. Vance, Representative (w/West)

11-H-4:Montecito Ranch, SP 01-001, GPA 04-013, TM 5250RPL. 935 Acres, 417 Homes. Project to Include a Wastewater Reclamation Facility. Required Transportation Improvements for Proposed Project. Access off Ash St.. Chris Brown, Proponent (w/West)

11-H-5:STP 09-005, Palomar Pomerado Health, Ramona Satellite Clinic, Main St. 2.6 acres. D5 Special Area Regulation Applies, 2 Story Clinic, 37,500 sq. ft. Access to be from Main St. and from 13th and 14th St. Miller, MetroPlan, Representative (w/CUDA)

11-H-6:Report of County Draft Public Road Standards Committee Meeting – To be Given at Next Meeting

11-I: DESIGN REVIEW (Anderson) – Update on Projects Reviewed by the Design Review Board – Included under individual project discussions, above.

11-J: RAMONA VILLAGE DESIGN (Brean, Stykel) Update on Ramona Village Design Committee Meetings

Mr. Brean reported that Ramona Village Design voted to recommend Big Box type development for the 14 acres across from Stater Bros., as previously discussed by the RCPG, with a maximum size of 100,000 sq. ft.

ITEM 12: OTHER BUSINESS (Chair)

A. Service First Initiative Update, Report from Meeting 10-10-09 at DPLU – Reported to be given at the January, 2010, meeting.

B. Report on Meeting at Supervisor Jacob's Office re: Hwy 67, 12-3-09

Mr. Piva reported on the meeting at Supervisor Jacob's office. The CHP presented a report on the continuing enforcement efforts by the CHP to make Hwy 67 safer. CalTrans presented a plan to improve the intersection of Highland Valley/Dye. Mr. Piva said we want to know when big issues are brought to Supervisor Jacob from people in Ramona so that we are aware of them and can address them at the Community level. Then we can let Supervisor Jacob know what our suggested solutions are and together we can come up with a solution. She said she would inform us in the

future. They also talked about involving legislators to help with funding improvements to Hwy 67 by bringing them shovel-ready projects and asking for assistance. Mr. Hickman was at the meeting and he said that they could improve the wait time at the Highland Valley/Dye intersection by synchronizing the light to allow simultaneous left turns. CalTrans said they would look into the feasibility of doing this. It was suggested after the Highland Valley/Dye improvements are done, maybe Archie Moore will be signalized. Mr. Hickman suggested signalizing the Mussey Grade intersection instead. People slow down to let traffic through on Mussey Grade which also backs up traffic on Hwy 67. Mr. Hickman also suggested moving the merge lane at Archie Moore Road to a straight section of the road so people can see traffic is backed up.

Ms. Mansolf will follow up with Supervisor Jacob's office on how we can be better informed of issues Ramona constituents bring to Supervisor Jacob. We also asked if we could refer to Supervisor Jacob's policy advisor for roads to make sure we stay on track when considering the Highland Valley/Dye proposed road improvements. It looks like they want us to consider using Capital Improvement Project money and TIF money to help with the improvements for Highland Valley/Dye. The San Vicente Road improvements are moving forward. We probably won't be able to do both.

MOTION: TO SEND A LETTER TO SUPERVISOR JACOB, REGARDING THE HWY 67 SUBCOMMITTEE, THAT THE ONLY AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVES FOR THE RCPG ARE CARL HICKMAN, JIM PIVA, FRANK COAKLEY AND KRISTI MANSOLF. ANYONE ELSE, STATING THAT THEY ARE ANY TYPE OF PLANNING GROUP REPRESENTATIVE DOES NOT HAVE THE AUTHORITY TO SPEAK FOR THE RCPG AND WILL BE REMOVED FROM SUBCOMMITTEE IF THEY DO SO.

Upon motion made by Jim Piva and seconded by Dennis Sprong, the Motion **passed 12-0-0-0-3**, with Matt Deskovick, Katherine L. Finley and Paul Stykel absent.

- C. **Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration for Subdivision Ordinance Update. Public Comments End 12-11-09.**
Available at:
http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dplu/ceqa_public_review.html -- Not Addressed

ITEM 13: ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS (Chair)

- A. **Names Submitted for New Subcommittee Members (Action)** – None
B. **Agenda Requests** – None
C. **Concerns of Members** – None
D. **RCPG Member Meeting Attendance – Concerns Over Members on the Group that do not Fulfill their Duty to Ramona to Attend the Meetings (whole or in part) and the Consequences of their Actions, Report on Meeting Attendance** – Report to be given at the January, 2010, meeting.

ITEM 14: ADJOURNMENT

Respectfully submitted,

Kristi Mansolf